Table D-21a. Industrial Sites and Parks Projects by County

Number, Estimated Cost and Percent in CIP\*
—Five-year Period July 2002 through June 2007\*\*

	Number of	Total Estimated	Percent of	Percent	Co	st Per
County	Projects	Cost	Total Cost	Cost in CIP		apita
Anderson	4	\$ 7,350,000	2.3%	15.0%	\$	103
Bedford	4	10,300,000	3.2%	0.0%	\$	269
Bledsoe	1	1,500,000	0.5%	0.0%	\$	120
Blount	3	2,320,000	0.7%	0.0%	\$	21
Bradley	2	1,000,000	0.3%	12.5%	\$	11
Campbell	5	2,830,000	0.9%	0.0%	\$	71
Cannon	1	2,000,000	0.6%	100.0%	\$	154
Carroll	2	2,100,000	0.7%	52.4%	\$	71
Carter	2	1,500,000	0.5%	0.0%	\$	26
Cheatham	3	3,600,000	1.1%	0.0%	\$	98
Claiborne	1	3,500,000	1.1%	0.0%	\$	116
Cocke	2	4,200,000	1.3%	0.0%	\$	124
Coffee	4	12,980,000	4.1%	0.0%	\$	267
Cumberland	3	6,000,000	1.9%	100.0%	\$	125
Decatur	3	3,700,000	1.2%	32.4%	\$	316
DeKalb	3	3,000,000	0.9%	66.7%	\$	171
Dickson	3	2,025,000	0.6%	0.0%	\$	46
Dyer	1	180,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	5
Fayette	2	2,500,000	0.8%	0.0%	\$	82
Franklin	3	685,145	0.2%	0.0%	\$	17
Gibson	4	1,500,000	0.5%	50.0%	\$	31
Giles	3	3,225,000	1.0%	0.0%	\$	109
Grainger	2	1,200,000	0.4%	0.0%	\$	57
Greene	1	6,000,000	1.9%	0.0%	\$	95
Hamblen	1	20,000,000	6.3%	0.0%	\$	343
Hamilton	2	5,750,000	1.8%	100.0%	\$	19
Hardeman	4	2,535,000	0.8%	80.3%	\$	89
Hardin	1	500,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$	19
Hawkins	2	6,000,000	1.9%	0.0%	\$	110
Haywood	2	2,000,000	0.6%	100.0%	\$	101
Henderson	1	150,000	0.0%	100.0%	\$	6
Hickman	2	4,000,000	1.3%	0.0%	\$	176
Houston	1	500,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$	63
Humphreys	6	6,900,000	2.2%	0.0%	\$	381
Jackson	1	250,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	22
Jefferson	1	2,000,000	0.6%	0.0%	\$	44
Johnson	1	1,000,000	0.3%	0.0%	\$	57
Knox	3	7,880,000	2.5%	100.0%	\$	20
Lake	1	130,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$	17
Lawrence	2	6,500,000	2.1%	0.0%	\$	162
Lewis	1	500,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$	44
Lincoln	3	6,850,000	2.2%	0.0%	\$	217
Loudon	2	8,000,000	2.2%	18.8%	э \$	199
McMinn	2	2,500,000	2.5% 0.8%	80.0%	э \$	50
IVICIVIIIIII		∠,500,000	0.8%	80.0%	Ф	50

Table D-21a. (continued)

	Number of	Total Estimated	Doroont of	Doroont	Ca	st Per
County			Percent of	Percent		
M. N	Projects	Cost	Total Cost	Cost in CIP		apita
McNairy	2	720,000	0.2%	41.7%	\$	29
Marion	4	1,342,600	0.4%	0.0%	\$	48
Marshall	3	19,000,000	6.0%	0.0%	\$	701
Maury	2	2,900,000	0.9%	69.0%	\$	41
Meigs	1	500,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$	45
Monroe	4	4,450,000	1.4%	0.0%	\$	112
Montgomery	3	22,029,000	6.9%	100.0%	\$	163
Moore	1	1,000,000	0.3%	0.0%	\$	170
Morgan	1	500,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$	25
Perry	1	500,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$	67
Pickett	2	650,000	0.2%	100.0%	\$	129
Polk	3	1,925,000	0.6%	0.0%	\$	119
Putnam	2	2,250,000	0.7%	100.0%	\$	36
Rhea	3	3,500,000	1.1%	21.4%	\$	122
Roane	1	8,000,000	2.5%	100.0%	\$	154
Robertson	2	1,200,000	0.4%	0.0%	\$	21
Rutherford	2	12,600,000	4.0%	20.6%	\$	66
Scott	3	1,368,710	0.4%	0.0%	\$	64
Sequatchie	1	200,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	17
Sevier	1	2,000,000	0.6%	0.0%	\$	27
Shelby	4	6,017,000	1.9%	51.5%	\$	7
Smith	1	1,000,000	0.3%	100.0%	\$	56
Sullivan	5	7,959,000	2.5%	22.1%	\$	52
Sumner	2	1,000,000	0.3%	50.0%	\$	7
Trousdale	8	11,355,000	3.6%	0.0%	\$	1,546
Unicoi	2	3,500,000	1.1%	0.0%	\$	198
Union	2	1,572,000	0.5%	0.0%	\$	85
Van Buren	1	750,000	0.3%	100.0%	\$	137
Washington	2	6,000,000	1.9%	100.0%	\$	55
Wayne	1	500,000	0.2%	100.0%	э \$	30
	2	550,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$	16
Weakley Wilson	3		0.2% 6.6%	0.0% 4.8%	\$	229
	176	21,000,000				
Statewide	1/0	\$ 316,978,455	100.0%	28.0%	\$	56

<sup>\*</sup> Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

\*\*Only those counties that reported projects in this category are shown.

Table D-21b. Industrial Site and Park Projects by County and by Stage of Development

		Cond	ceptual			Planning & Design				Construction			
County	Nu	mber	Cost [in	millions]	Nu	mber	Cost [in	millions]	Νι	ımber	Cost [in	millions]	
Anderson	1	25.0%	\$ 5.0	68.0%	1	25.0%	\$ 0.3	4.1%	2	50.0%	\$ 2.1	27.9%	
Bedford	4	100.0%	10.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Bledsoe	1	100.0%	1.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Blount	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	66.7%	0.6	26.7%	1	33.3%	1.7	73.3%	
Bradley	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Campbell	3	60.0%	2.0	68.9%	2	40.0%	0.9	31.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Cannon	1	100.0%	2.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Carroll	1	50.0%	1.0	47.6%	1	50.0%	1.1	52.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Carter	2	100.0%	1.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Cheatham	3	100.0%	3.6	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Claiborne	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	3.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Cocke	1	50.0%	1.2	28.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	3.0	71.4%	
Coffee	1	25.0%	0.4	2.9%	2	50.0%	8.1	62.4%	1	25.0%	4.5	34.7%	
Cumberland	3	100.0%	6.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Decatur	2 3	66.7%	3.0	81.1%	1	33.3%	0.7	18.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
DeKalb		100.0%	3.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0		0	0.0%	
Dickson	3	100.0%	2.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Dyer	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Fayette	2	100.0%	2.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Franklin	1	33.3%	0.1	14.6%	1	33.3%	0.1	12.4%	1	33.3%	0.5	73.0%	
Gibson	2	50.0%	0.8	50.0%	2	50.0%	0.8	50.0%	0		0	0.0%	
Giles	2	66.7%	3.0	93.0%	1	33.3%	0.2	7.0%	0		0	0.0%	
Grainger	1	50.0%	0.4	33.3%	1	50.0%	0.8	66.7%	0		0	0.0%	
Greene	1	100.0%	6.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0		0	0.0%	
Hamblen	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	20.0	100.0%	
Hamilton	1	50.0%	3.0	52.2%	1	50.0%	2.8	47.8%	0		0	0.0%	
Hardeman	2	50.0%	1.5	59.2%	1	25.0%	0.7	25.6%	1	25.0%	0.4	15.2%	
Hardin	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0		0	0.0%	
Hawkins	2	100.0%	6.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0		0	0.0%	
Haywood	1	50.0%	0.5	25.0%	1	50.0%	1.5	75.0%	0			0.0%	
Henderson	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0		0	0.0%	
Hickman	1	50.0%	1.5	37.5%	1	50.0%	2.5	62.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Houston	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0			0.0%	
Humphreys	5	83.3%	4.2	60.9%	1	16.7%	2.7	39.1%	0			0.0%	
Jackson	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	

	Conceptual					Planning	g & Desig	n	Construction			
County	Nu	mber	Cost [in i	millions]	Nu	mber	Cost [in		Nu	ımber	Cost [in	millions]
Jefferson	1	100.0%	2.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%		0.0%
Johnson	1	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Knox	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	66.7%	7.4	94.2%	1	33.3%	0.5	5.8%
Lake	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Lawrence	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	5.0	76.9%	1	50.0%	1.5	23.1%
Lewis	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Lincoln	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	66.7%	5.8	83.9%	1	33.3%	1.1	16.1%
Loudon	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	1.5	18.8%	1	50.0%	6.5	81.3%
McMinn	1	50.0%	0.5	20.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	2.0	80.0%
McNairy	1	50.0%	0.3	41.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0.4	58.3%
Marion	1	25.0%	0.4	26.1%	3	75.0%	1.0	73.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Marshall	3	100.0%	19.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Maury	1	50.0%	2.0	69.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0.9	31.0%
Meigs	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%
Monroe	2	50.0%	1.8	39.3%	2	50.0%	2.7	60.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Montgomery	1	33.3%	3.8	17.0%	1	33.3%	1.2	5.4%	1	33.3%	17.1	77.5%
Moore	1	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0			0.0%
Morgan	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0			0.0%
Perry	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0		0	0.0%
Pickett	2	100.0%	0.7	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0		0	0.0%
Polk	2	66.7%	0.4	22.1%	1	33.3%	1.5	77.9%	0			0.0%
Putnam	2	100.0%	2.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%		0.0%
Rhea	2	66.7%	2.3	64.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	33.3%		35.7%
Roane	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	8.0	100.0%
Robertson	1	50.0%	0.7	58.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%		41.7%
Rutherford	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	10.0	79.4%	1	50.0%		20.6%
Scott	1	33.3%	0.5	36.5%	2	66.7%	0.9	63.5%	0		0	0.0%
Sequatchie	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0		0	0.0%
Sevier	1	100.0%	2.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0			0.0%
Shelby	3	75.0%	2.9	48.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	25.0%	3.1	51.5%
Smith	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	0	0.0%		0.0%
Sullivan	4	80.0%	7.8	97.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%		2.5%
Sumner	2	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0			0.0%
Trousdale	4	50.0%	7.1	62.1%	4	50.0%	4.3	37.9%	0			0.0%
Unicoi	2	100.0%	3.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0			0.0%
Union	1	50.0%	1.2	76.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0.4	23.7%

Table D-21b. (continued)

Table D-21b. (continued)

					<del></del>	1.0. (00							
		Con	ceptual		Planning & Design					Construction			
County	Nu	mber	Cost [in r	nillions]	Nui	nber	Cost [in	millions]	Nu	mber	Cost [	in millio	ns]
Van Buren	1	100.0%	0.8	100.0%	0	0.0%	(	0.0%	0	0.0%		0 0	0.0%
Washington	1	50.0%	1.0	16.7%	0	0.0%	(	0.0%	1	50.0%	Ę	5.0 83	3.3%
Wayne	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	(	0.0%	0	0.0%		0 0	0.0%
Weakley	2	100.0%	0.6	100.0%	0	0.0%	(	0.0%	0	0.0%		0 0	0.0%
Wilson	2	66.7%	20.0	95.2%	1	33.3%	1.0	4.8%	0	0.0%		0 0	0.0%
Statewide	105	59.7%	\$ 161.3	50.9%	46	26.1%	\$ 72.0	22.7%	25	14.2%	\$ 83	3.6 26	6.4%

<sup>\*</sup> Only those counties that reported projects in this category are shown.

Table D-22a. Public Building Projects by County

Number, Estimated Cost and Percent in CIP\*

—Five-year Period July 2002 through June 2007\*\*

	Number of	Total Estimated	Percent of	Percent	Cos	st Per
County	Projects	Cost		Cost in CIP		apita
Anderson	5	\$ 2,920,000	0.9%		\$	41
Bledsoe	1	250,000	0.1%		\$	20
Blount	5	21,500,000	7.0%		\$	199
Bradley	2	3,650,000	1.2%	95.9%	\$	41
Cannon	2	200,000	0.1%		\$	15
Cheatham	3	7,240,000	2.4%	0.0%	\$	198
Chester	2	6,082,000	2.4%	9.6%	\$	387
Claiborne	1	80,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$	307
Cocke	2	1,680,000	0.0%		\$	50
	1				э \$	
Cumberland		5,000,000	1.6%			104
Davidson	20	50,069,000	16.3%		\$	89
Decatur	5	3,340,000	1.1%	67.4%	\$	286
Dickson	1	2,500,000	0.8%		\$	57
Dyer	2	8,250,000	2.7%		\$	222
Fayette	1	230,000	0.1%		\$	8
Franklin	4	1,370,000	0.4%	0.0%	\$	34
Gibson	2	300,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	6
Giles	3	1,750,000	0.6%	0.0%	\$	59
Greene	1	150,000	0.0%		\$	2
Hamblen	1	2,000,000	0.7%	0.0%	\$	34
Hamilton	1	550,000	0.2%		\$	2
Hancock	2	500,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$	74
Hardeman	3	1,050,000	0.3%	100.0%	\$	37
Hardin	1	100,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$	4
Hawkins	1	1,000,000	0.3%	0.0%	\$	18
Henderson	2	1,050,000	0.3%	100.0%	\$	41
Hickman	1	1,500,000	0.5%	0.0%	\$	66
Humphreys	1	500,000	0.2%	100.0%	\$	28
Jefferson	1	191,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$	4
Johnson	1	300,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	17
Knox	6	13,391,074	4.4%	93.7%	\$	35
Lauderdale	1	1,033,000	0.3%	100.0%	\$	38
Lawrence	1	150,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$	4
Lewis	1	700,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$	61
Lincoln	1	200,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	6
Loudon	2	3,200,000	1.0%	100.0%		80
McMinn	2	1,900,000	0.6%		\$	38
McNairy	3	650,000	0.2%		\$	26
Madison	4	3,650,000	1.2%		\$	40
Marion	2	975,000	0.3%	76.9%		35
Maury	5	2,001,000	0.7%			28
Monroe	1	1,500,000	0.7%	0.0%	\$	38
Montgomery	1	1,700,000	0.5%	100.0%	\$	13
Obion	5	2,400,000	0.8%	100.0 %		74
	)	∠,400,000	0.0%	10.4%	Ψ	74

Table D-22a. (continued)

County	Number of	Total Estimated	Percent of	Percent	Cos	st Per
County	Projects	Cost	<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>Cost in CIP</b>	Ca	apita
Overton	1	2,000,000	0.7%	100.0%	\$	99
Putnam	3	500,000	0.2%	60.0%	\$	8
Rhea	2	2,650,000	0.9%	0.0%	\$	93
Roane	2	2,000,000	0.7%	50.0%	\$	38
Rutherford	2	3,900,000	1.3%	89.7%	\$	21
Sequatchie	1	150,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$	13
Sevier	2	158,554	0.1%	59.0%	\$	2
Shelby	22	97,184,995	31.6%	100.0%	\$	108
Smith	1	500,000	0.2%	100.0%	\$	28
Sullivan	7	4,730,000	1.5%	75.1%	\$	31
Sumner	6	8,816,000	2.9%	0.0%	\$	66
Tipton	1	2,500,000	0.8%	0.0%	\$	47
Unicoi	1	2,000,000	0.7%	0.0%	\$	113
Union	2	590,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$	32
Van Buren	1	500,000	0.2%	100.0%	\$	91
Washington	2	3,000,000	1.0%	100.0%	\$	28
Wayne	1	200,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	12
Weakley	1	750,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$	22
Williamson	4	15,390,000	5.0%	100.0%	\$	115
Wilson	1	1,000,000	0.3%	0.0%	\$	11
Regional	1	100,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$	0
Statewide	177	\$ 307,371,623	100.0%	79.6%	\$	54

<sup>\*</sup> Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

\*\*Only those counties that reported projects in this category are shown.

Appendix D: Reported Infrastructure Needs by County

Table D-22b. Public Building Projects by County and by Stage of Development

			ceptual				g & Desig				truction	
County	Nu	mber	Cost [in	millions]	Nu	mber	Cost [in	millions]	Nu	mber	Cost [in r	millions]
Anderson	4	80.0%	\$ 2.7	91.4%	0	0.0%	\$ 0	0.0%	1	20.0%	\$ 0.3	8.6%
Bledsoe	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Blount	2	40.0%	0.9	4.2%	2	40.0%	20.4	94.7%	1	20.0%	0.3	1.2%
Bradley	1	50.0%	3.5	95.9%	1	50.0%	0.2	4.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Cannon	1	50.0%	0.1	25.0%	1	50.0%	0.2	75.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Cheatham	3	100.0%	7.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Chester	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0.6	9.6%	1	50.0%	5.5	90.4%
Claiborne	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%
Cocke	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0.8	47.6%	1	50.0%	0.9	52.4%
Cumberland	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	5.0	100.0%
Davidson	8	40.0%	7.4	14.8%	3	15.0%	28.8	57.5%	9	45.0%	13.8	27.6%
Decatur	2	40.0%	0.2	7.2%	2	40.0%	3.0	89.8%	1	20.0%	0.1	3.0%
Dickson	1	100.0%	2.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Dyer	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	8.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Fayette	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Franklin	1	25.0%	0.6	43.8%	1	25.0%	0.1	5.1%	2	50.0%	0.7	51.1%
Gibson	2	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Giles	3	100.0%	1.8	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Greene	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%
Hamblen	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	2.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hamilton	1	100.0%	0.6	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hancock	2	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hardeman	1	33.3%	0.2	19.0%	2	66.7%	0.9	81.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hardin	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hawkins	1	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Henderson	1	50.0%	0.8	71.4%	1	50.0%	0.3	28.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hickman	1	100.0%	1.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Humphreys	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Jefferson	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%
Johnson	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Knox	2	33.3%	0.9	6.3%	2	33.3%	5.8	43.0%	2	33.3%	6.8	50.6%
Lauderdale	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Lawrence	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Lewis	1	100.0%	0.7	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Lincoln	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

Table D-22b. (continued)

г				l	able D		ntinued)		T				
		Con	ceptual				g & Desig	n	Construction				
County	Nu	mber	Cost [in	millions]	Nu	mber	Cost [in		Nu	mber	Cost [in I	millions]	
Loudon	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	3.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
McMinn	2	100.0%	1.9	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
McNairy	2	66.7%	0.4	53.8%		33.3%	0.3	46.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Madison	1	25.0%	0.5	13.7%	3	75.0%	3.2	86.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Marion	2	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Maury	2	40.0%	0.4	20.7%	3	60.0%	1.6	79.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Monroe	1	100.0%	1.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Montgomery	0	0.0%	0	0.0%		0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1.7	100.0%	
Obion	2	40.0%	0.3	12.5%	2	40.0%	0.4	15.6%	1	20.0%	1.7	71.9%	
Overton	1	100.0%	2.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Putnam	2	66.7%	0.4	80.0%	1	33.3%	0.1	20.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Rhea	1	50.0%	2.0	75.5%	1	50.0%	0.7	24.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Roane	2	100.0%	2.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Rutherford	2	100.0%	3.9	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Sequatchie	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Sevier	1	50.0%	0.1	41.0%	1	50.0%	0.1	59.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Shelby	2	9.1%	1.0	1.0%	8	36.4%	30.5	31.3%	12	54.5%	65.7	67.6%	
Smith	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	
Sullivan	2	28.6%	1.2	24.9%	3	42.9%	0.4	7.5%	2	28.6%	3.2	67.6%	
Sumner	4	66.7%	8.5	96.6%	2	33.3%	0.3	3.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Tipton	1	100.0%	2.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Unicoi	1	100.0%	2.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Union	1	50.0%	0.4	67.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0.2	32.2%	
Van Buren	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Washington	2	100.0%	3.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Wayne	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Weakley	1	100.0%	0.8	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Williamson	2	50.0%	5.3	34.1%	1	25.0%	10.0	65.0%	1	25.0%	0.1	0.9%	
Wilson	1	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Regional	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Statewide	83	46.9%	\$ 76.4	24.8%	53	29.9%	\$ 124.1	40.4%	41	23.2%	\$ 106.9	34.8%	

<sup>\*</sup> Only those counties that reported projects in this category are shown.

Table D-23a. Other Facilities Projects by County

Number, Estimated Cost and Percent in CIP\*
—Five-year Period July 2002 through June 2007\*\*

	Number of	Total Estimated	Percent of	Percent	Cos	t Per
County	Projects	Cost		Cost in CIP		pita
Bedford	1	\$ 1,500,000	2.5%	0.0%	\$	39
Blount		2,000,000	3.4%	100.0%	\$	18
		3,500,000	5.4% 5.9%	100.0%	Ф \$	39
Bradley					т .	
Carroll	1	400,000	0.7%	0.0%	\$	14
Carter	1	60,000	0.1%	0.0%	т .	1
Cheatham	1	300,000	0.5%	0.0%	\$	8
Davidson	3	10,570,000	17.8%	100.0%	\$	19
Decatur	1	2,000,000	3.4%	100.0%	\$	171
Franklin	1	200,000	0.3%	0.0%	\$	5
Greene	3	500,000	0.8%	0.0%	\$	8
Jefferson	1	150,000	0.3%	0.0%	\$	3
Knox	1	3,000,000	5.1%	100.0%	\$	8
Lawrence	1	979,000	1.7%	0.0%	\$	24
Loudon	1	1,300,000	2.2%	100.0%	\$	32
McMinn	3	3,350,000	5.7%	0.0%	\$	67
Maury	2	335,000	0.6%	100.0%	\$	5
Rhea	1	800,000	1.4%	0.0%	\$	28
Roane	1	1,500,000	2.5%	100.0%	\$	29
Sevier	1	63,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	1
Shelby	12	18,637,140	31.5%	100.0%	\$	21
Sullivan	1	290,000	0.5%	100.0%	\$	2
Unicoi	1 1	185,000	0.3%	0.0%	\$	10
Washington	2	328,000	0.6%	100.0%	\$	3
Wayne	_ 1	300,000	0.5%	0.0%	\$	18
Williamson	1	2,000,000	3.4%	100.0%	\$	15
Wilson	l 1	5,000,000	8.4%	0.0%	\$	55
Statewide Total	45	\$ 59,247,140	100.0%	76.7%	\$	10
		<del></del>				

<sup>\*</sup> Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

<sup>\*\*</sup>Only those counties that reported projects in this category are shown.

## Table D-23b. Other Facility Projects by County and by Stage of Development

	Conceptual				7 7 7 7 7 7	Planning & Design				Construction			
County	Nu	mber	Cost [in	millions]	Nu	ımber	Cost [in	millions]	Nu	ımber	Cost [in i	nillions]	
Bedford	0	0.0%	\$ 0	0.0%	1	100.0%	\$ 1.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	\$ 0	0.0%	
Blount	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	2.0	100.0%	
Bradley	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	3.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Carroll	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Carter	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Cheatham	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Davidson	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%	10.6	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Decatur	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	2.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Franklin	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Greene	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	0.3	60.0%	2	66.7%	0.2	40.0%	
Jefferson	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Knox	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	3.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Lawrence	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Loudon	1	100.0%	1.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
McMinn	1	33.3%	1.4	40.3%	1	33.3%	1.0	29.9%	1	33.3%	1.0	29.9%	
Maury	2	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Rhea	1	100.0%	0.8	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Roane	1	100.0%	1.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Sevier	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	
Shelby	6	50.0%	9.1	48.9%	6	50.0%	9.5	51.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Sullivan	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	
Unicoi	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Washington	2	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Wayne	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Williamson	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	2.0	100.0%	
Wilson	1	100.0%	5.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Statewide	19	42.2%	\$ 20.4	34.5%	19	42.2%	\$ 33.3	56.2%	7	15.6%	\$ 5.6	9.4%	

<sup>\*</sup> Only those counties that reported projects in this category are shown.

## Table D-24a. Property Acquisition Projects by County

Number, Estimated Cost and Percent in CIP\*
—Five-year Period July 2002 through June 2007\*\*

County	Number of Projects	Tot	al Estimated Cost		Percent Cost in CIP	st Per apita
Anderson	1	\$	2,995,200	41.4%	100.0%	\$ 42
Davidson	1		2,518,000	34.8%	100.0%	\$ 4
Johnson	1		80,000	1.1%	0.0%	\$ 5
Montgomery	1		300,000	4.1%	100.0%	\$ 2
Sevier	1		250,000	3.5%	0.0%	\$ 3
Shelby	2		900,000	12.4%	100.0%	\$ 1
Williamson	1_		200,000	2.8%	100.0%	\$ 1
Statewide Total	8	\$	7,243,200	100.0%	95.4%	\$ 1

<sup>\*</sup> Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

Table D-24b. Property Acquisition Projects by County and by Stage of Development

	Conceptual				Planning & Design					Construction			
County	Number		Cost [in millions]		Nui	Number		Cost [in millions]		Number		Cost [in millions]	
Anderson	0	0.0%	\$ 0	0.0%	1	100.0%	\$	3.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	\$ 0	0.0%
Davidson	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%		2.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Johnson	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%		0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Montgomery	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%		0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%
Sevier	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%		0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Shelby	1	50.0%	0.1	11.1%	1	50.0%		0.8	88.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Williamson	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%		0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Statewide	4	50.0%	\$ 0.6	8.7%	3	37.5%	\$	6.3	87.2%	1	12.5%	\$ 0.3	4.1%

<sup>\*</sup> Only those counties that reported projects in this category are shown.

<sup>\*\*</sup>Only those counties that reported projects in this category are shown.